2:Purcell G-4 (no date) 1951 AL1 Southeast Asia AL1
Chinese

The adoption of *Kuo Yü* as a medium of instruction in schools is about one-half of the story of education in China under the Kuomintang: the other half is the adoption in 1928 of the Three Principles of the People of Dr Sun Yat-sen as the foundation of the education system.

The overseas Chinese of the Nanyang adopted with fervour the new style of education which the Revolution had brought into being. They started and ran their own schools, and the resultant rise of Nationalist feeling made the Governments of the several countries more and more apprehensive of the creation of an *imperium in imperio* in their midst.[1] Such was particularly the case in Malaya and Siam, and the crux of the friction between the China-born Chinese and the local administration has been their differences regarding the aim and control of this education. This will emerge in the course of the individual country studies of our survey.

The majority of the emigrants had little or no schooling before going abroad. It is reasonably certain that until quite recently the average emigrant was not a man of education at all, or at most he had had a very inadequate schooling before emigrating.

Religion. On going overseas to the Nanyang the Chinese took with them their religious beliefs. Be the principle of Buddhism, Taoism, or Confucianism effective or ossified, there can be no doubt at all that the world of spirits, demons, gods, and heroes is still a very real thing to the majority of Chinese and goes with them wherever they go. Dr Ta Chen notes that among the items of household expenditure other than food, clothing, and shelter, that for religious practices predominates over all others both in the emigrant and non-emigrant families of east Kwangtung and south Fukien. ('These expenditures', he says, 'are a good index of the prevalence of religious concern.') Scepticism has assuredly grown with the advance of education, but for the majority it would seem that 'keeping in' with the Great Unseen was as much a matter of insurance as of piety and ethics.

Broadly speaking, the religion of the villagers of south China consists of the worship of Shen, Fu, and Yao in addition to the cult of their own ancestors. Shen and Fu are spirits from Buddhism and Taoism (especially the popular, corrupted, and confused aspects of

[1] See Cyrus H. Peake, *Nationalism and Education in Modern China* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932).

2:Purcell G-4 (no date) 1951 AL1 Southeast Asia AL1
Chinese

771
167

the two religious systems); whereas Yao, a ghost, is from primitive ancestor worship via Confucianism. In one emigrant community in south Fukien Dr Ta Chen's investigators found that of 224 persons questioned, 154 expressed belief in Shen and Fu, 60 had no religious preferences, 5 believed in Christianity, and 5 seemed to be wavering between acceptance and rejection of Shen and Fu. Comparative popularity would, we may be sure, depend largely on results; for, like the Roman gods, a Chinese god is expected to render a return for respect accorded and the offerings made to him. A Roman observed his rites with scrupulous adherence to the letter of the law, expecting that if he did not the gods would make it an excuse to wriggle out of the bargain, and the Chinese regard their gods in much the same spirit.[1]

Amongst the most popular goddesses in the Buddhist pantheon both in China and overseas is Kwan Yin, the goddess of mercy, 'she who hears the sounds (prayers) of mortals—she who looks down on the world and hears its cries'. She is the counterpart of the Taoist goddess T'ien Hou Sheng Mu, Holy Mother, queen of heaven, and she is credited with attributes similar to those of the Virgin Mary. Kwan Yin was originally the Buddhist male god, Avalokiteswara, who changed his sex to female some centuries after his arrival in China.

Another popular god among the overseas Chinese is Kwan Ti, the god of war.

Each craft or guild has its own patron saint—Wu Ku Lao Yeh for farmers, Chiao Sheng Lao Yeh (whose festival is on the 7th of the 5th moon) for carpenters, Shui Hsin Lao Yeh for incense-stick makers, Kwan Ti, the god of war, in his capacity of god of wealth, for tradesmen, and T'ien Hou Sheng Mu, the Taoist queen of heaven, for fishermen and sailors (but overseas her name is changed to Ma Tsu (Ma Chew Poh)), which is also popular in Amoy. In many Cantonese houses the image of the household god of the earth, T'o Yei Shan or Tei Chu, is placed *underneath* a table! The god is not worshipped in Hokkien households.

In addition to the worship of the standard deities of the Buddhist and Taoist cults, the Chinese of the Nanyang have special deities

[1] See Ta Chen, op. cit. chap. x, and Purcell, *The Chinese in Malaya*, chap. vi. There is an instructive article, 'Chinese Contemporary Cults', by Clarence Burton Day in the *Far Eastern Quarterly*, vol. vi, no. 3 (May 1947), which covers a number of the gods and heroes worshipped in south China and the Nanyang.

2:Purcell G-4 (no date) 1951 AL1 Southeast Asia AL1
Chinese

of their own which are worshipped by them only overseas or in the emigrant communities from which they sprang. The outstanding examples are Sam Po Tai Shan for the Shen, and Toh Peh Kong (Hokkien), Ta Pai Kung (Mandarin), or Tai Pak Kung (Cantonese) for the Fu.

Sam Po Tai Shan is none other than the spirit of the famous Grand Eunuch Cheng Ho of the Ming dynasty who visited Malacca in the early years of the fifteenth century.[1] He is particularly worshipped in Malacca. Crawfurd remarks, 'Sam Po Kung (Sam Po Tai Shan) is evidently a name to be conjured with among the illiterate classes. The miracles which he performed to save his countrymen from the perils of their travels in unknown lands are among the marvels of romance, illustrating, in a striking way, one of the factors in a genesis of a myth.'

Toh Peh Kong, however, is the most popular hero among the overseas Chinese. But one may search for him in vain in the standard books on Chinese religion.[2] In Siam he is known as Pan Tou Kung. He probably derives from Tu Ti (earth god), but overseas he is primarily the spirit of the pioneers. The Chinese pioneers of the early days suffered terrible hardships and were honoured in memory by those who came after them. Toh Peh Kong seems to be the personification of the pioneer spirit generally and is not the deification of a special person as Sam Po Tai Shan is of Cheng Ho.

A worship of very long standing in Malaya is that of Wang Yeh, who has the spiritual function of visiting the universe as the representative of heaven. The early settlers brought the worship with them from Fukien province.[3]

Opium and other narcotics. The use of the poppy and coca leaf goes back to time immemorial.[4] In 1783 Warren Hastings pro-

[1] See pp. 22, 23.

[2] In particular the monumental work by Henri F. S. Doré, *Recherches sur les superstitions en Chine* (Shanghai, Tu-se-wei Press, 1911–38).

[3] Wang Yeh was worshipped from early days but the Wang Kang Festival in Malacca wherein five images of this deity were carried does not seem to have originated until 1886.

Chinese Mohammedan[s] in the Shan States and in Indonesia, though in the latter country their nu[m]bers are not great. Chinese Christians are not very numerous in Southeast Asia, though in Malaya, for example, they increased between 1901 and 1931 by one-half (50·2 per cent.) to 30,738, while during the same period the Chinese population increased by only 45·5 per cent. Among the Churches the Roman Catholic Church has the strongest hold.

[4] Opium comes from a certain variety of the poppy plant grown principally

14; Heine-Geldern E-4 (no date) 1942 ALl Southeast Asia ALl

643 772 with Mount Meru itself, his right eye representing the sun, his left eye the moon, his arms and legs the four cardinal points, the six-tiered umbrella above his head the six lower heavens, his pointed crown the spire of Indra's palace on the summit of the Meru and his slippers the earth. This means that the king is identified with the axis of the universe. The same idea seems to be expressed by the title Paku Buwono, "Nail of the World," of the Susuhunan of Solo in Java. However, the identification of the king with the Meru is in no way incompatible with that with Indra. Plural symbolism is very frequent in Buddhist Farther India. Thus in Burma, where the king has all the attributes of Indra, he was also identified with Viśvakarma, the divine architect and shaper of the world. Moreover, there is strong evidence of his having been identified also with the sun.

THE COSMIC STATE AND THE DIVINE KING

771 643 The cosmic state, as it existed in Southeast Asia, was intimately bound up with the idea of divine kingship. The divinity of kings was conceived in various ways according to the prevailing religion. Where Hinduism prevailed the king was considered to be either an incarnation of a god or a descendant from a god or both. Mostly it was Śiva who was thought to incarnate himself in kings or to engender dynasties. Thus in a Cham inscription of the 9th century Uroja, the founder of the royal dynasty, is said to have been a son of Śiva. The Javanese poem Nāgarakrtāgama (14th century) says bluntly that all kings are incarnations of Śiva. The same poem tells us more specially that king Rājasanāgara of Majapahit (1350–1389 A.D.), as proved by various portents which occurred about the time of his birth, among others a volcanic eruption, was an incarnation of Bhatāra Girinātha, i.e. Śiva as "Lord of the Mountain." In the Javanese chronicle Pararaton king Krtajaya of Kadiri (13th century) on one occasion even shows himself in the superhuman form of Śiva with four arms and a third eye in the middle of the forehead and floating in the air. In ancient Cambodia and Champa the monarchy was intimately bound up with the cult of a lingam which was considered the seat of the divine essence of kingship. As we have seen, in Cambodia this lingam, representing the Devarāja, the "God King," was adored in the temple in the center of the capital. The actual king was considered to be a manifestation of the divine power of the Devarāja and therefore, as the latter's visible form, the lingam, implies, obviously of Śiva himself.

However, Śiva was not the only god to incarnate himself in kings. King Airlangga of Java (11th century) considered himself an incarnation of Vishnu. His memorial monument shows him in the form of Vishnu riding on

14: Heine-Geldern E-4 (no date) 1942 ALI Southeast Asia ALI

the latter's man-eagle Garuda. Another noteworthy example of an incarnation of Vishnu was king Sūryavarman II of Cambodia (12th century) who erected his own memorial monument as a gigantic temple of Vishnu: the famous Angkor Vat. We find further the idea of plural incarnation, also known from ancient India. Thus the Pararaton tells us that Angrok (13th century), the founder of the dynasty of Singasari and ancestor of the kings of Majapahit, was an incarnation of Vishnu, begotten by Brahmā from a mortal woman, and at the same time a son of Śiva. King Krtarājasa (died 1316 A.D.), the founder of the empire of Majapahit, is immortalized by a statue representing him as Harihara, a compound of Vishnu and Śiva. Even the simultaneous incarnation of Hindu and Mahāyāna Buddhist deities occurs. Thus, to quote only one example, the Javanese king Krtanagara (killed 1292 A.D.) was considered as an incarnation of Śiva as well as of the Dhyāni Buddha Akshobhya. Accordingly, he became known in Javanese tradition under the name of Śiva-Buddha.

It may be added that the theory of divine incarnation could be used not only as a means to exalt the position of the legitimate king, but equally well as a justification for usurpation of the throne. Thus the above mentioned Angrok, the founder of the kingdom of Singasari, was an usurper with a long criminal career as embezzler, robber and murderer. Yet, in spite of his criminal past, he became king, according to the Pararaton, because he was an incarnation of the gods.

The theory of divine incarnation as found in Hinduism and Mahāyāna Buddhism is incompatible with the doctrine of the Buddhism of the Hīnayāna. This difference in tenets is clearly expressed even in the lay-out of capital cities. In ancient Cambodia a temple formed the center of the capital and thus the Mount Meru of city and empire. In Burma the center of the capital is invariably occupied by the royal palace, and it is this latter which is identified with Mount Meru. In ancient Cambodia either Śiva in his form as Devarāja, the eternal essence of kingship, or the Bodhisatva Lokeśvara, the "Lord of the Universe," inhabited the "central mountain" and from there pervaded the empire. Hīnayānist Buddhism does not recognize an eternal deity. Indra is but the king of one of the lowest heavens, the second one from the earth. He is as little exempt from death and rebirth as any human being, except that his life lasts longer. The same may be said of the inhabitants of the higher heavens. All these "gods" of Hīnayāna Buddhism should more appropriately be called angels. They have no temples and no cults. Thus it is easy to understand why in Burma no temple could be set in the center of the capital city. The adaptation to cosmological principles and

14; Heine-Geldern E-4 (no date) 1942 - ALl Southeast Asia ALl

the deification of the king here had to be attempted by other means. By erecting the palace in the center of the city and by identifying it with Mount Meru, the lord of the palace, i.e. the king became automatically the representative of Indra. We might even say that he was "the Indra" of this smaller universe, the Burmese empire but he held his place only by the magic of parallelism and he was no incarnation of the real Indra as the ancient Javanese and Cambodian kings had been incarnations of Śiva and Vishnu.[7] This scheme explains the great sanctity in which the royal palace was held in the Buddhist empires of Farther India. The palace was the symbol of the celestial mountain, nay, more than a mere symbol: it was "the Mount Meru" of the microcosmos Burma, or Siam, or Cambodia. Anybody nearing the palace had to show his reverence by dismounting from his horse, by shutting his parasol, by bowing to the palace spire or even kneeling down. Attempts to exact the same expressions of reverence from British envoys led to endless negotiations and frictions as the latter refused to comply with a demand which they considered humiliating. "King of the Golden Palace" was one of the most important titles of Burmese monarchs. Yet, the fact that the king "was Indra" and therefore ruler of the country only as possessor of the empire's Meru, the palace, involved great dangers. It worked as a constant temptation for would-be usurpers, be it from the ranks of the royal family or outsiders, as the occupation of the palace might be achieved by a coup-de-main with relatively small forces and usually meant the conquest of the whole empire. Many Burmese and Siamese kings therefore were virtual prisoners in their palace which they did not dare to leave for fear it might be seized by an usurper. The last king of Burma, Thibaw, preferred even to forego the important coronation ritual of the circumambulation of the capital to offering one of his relatives a chance to make himself master of the palace while he was away.

In Hīnayāna Buddhism the idea of divine incarnation as justification of kingship is replaced by that of rebirth and of religious merit. It is his good karma, his religious merit acquired in previous lives, which makes a man be born a king or makes him acquire kingship during his lifetime, be it even by rebellion and murder. A typical instance is that of king Nyaung-u Sawrahan (10th century) as told in the Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma. Nyaung-u Sawrahan, a farmer, kills the king who has trespassed on his garden and whom he had not recognized. Thereupon he is himself made king against his wish. So strong is his karma that, when one of the ministers ob-

[7] However, strong traces of the belief that Śiva and Vishnu incarnate themselves in the king survive in the coronation rituals of Siam and Cambodia.

14: Heine-Geldern E-4 (no date) 1942 ALl Southeast Asia ALl

jects to his installation, the stone statue of a guardian deity at the palace door becomes alive and kills the minister. The chronicle's comment is significant: "Although in verity king Sawrahan should have utterly perished, having killed a king when he was yet a farmer, he attained even to kingship simply by strong karma of his good acts done in the past." But the moment the karma of his past good acts is exhausted, that same stone statue which formerly had killed his adversary becomes alive again and hurls him from the palace terrace.

No merit could exceed that of a service rendered to the Buddha himself. Thus the Glass Palace Chronicle tells us that the ogre-guardian of a mountain, who had shielded the Buddha from the sun with three leaves, had received from the latter a prophecy that he would thrice become king of Burma. In the 10th century he is reborn in lowly surroundings as Saleh Ngahkwe, who later becomes king by murdering his predecessor and, "being reborn from the state of an ogre, was exceeding wrathful and haughty," indulging in gluttony and sadistic murder, till he is at last killed by his own ministers. One should think that the merit of having shaded the Buddha would have been exhausted by a life full of crimes. However, according to the Burmese chronicle, this is not so. The former mountain spirit is reborn in the 12th century as prince Narathu who becomes king by murdering his father and brother and throughout his reign excells by bloody deeds, and in the 13th century as king Narathihapate. This leads us to a very characteristic conception of historical events as based on the enormous importance attributed to prophecies and portents. Indeed, one could say that, especially as far as alleged prophecies of the Buddha are concerned, in the view of Burmese historians events are not prophesied because they will happen, but they happen because they have been prophesied. The "discovery" of ancient prophecies and the "observation" of contemporary portents was a generally used expedient in Burmese politics and still forms a potent factor in what we may call political folk-lore.

The whole idea and outward form of kingship in Southeast Asia, and specially in the Buddhist kingdoms of Farther India, was of course based on the conception of the Chakravartin, the Universal Monarch. Now it is known that a Chakravartin is the worldly alternative to a Bodhisatva, a future Buddha. Under these circumstances the theory of rebirth and of karma was bound to induce monarchs with a very high idea of their religious merits to consider themselves as Bodhisatvas. Thus, Oung Zaya, the founder of the last dynasty of Burma, took as king the name Alaungpaya which designated him as an Embryo Buddha. His son, king Bodawpaya (1782–1819), claimed outright to be the Bodhisatva Maitreya. However, his claim was rejected by the clergy

14: Heine-Geldern E-4 (no date) 1942 ALI Southeast Asia ALI

643 771

and he dropped it. A similar claim was put forth by king Taksin of Siam (1767–1782).

The theory of vocation to kingship either on the basis of divine incarnation, as in Java and ancient Cambodia, or by karma acquired in former lives, as in Burma, Siam and modern Cambodia, did not deprive that of the heredity of the right to the crown of its importance. Again and again usurpers have striven for a semblance of legitimacy by construing genealogies linking themselves either to the dynasty they had overthrown or to a dynasty which at an earlier period had governed the country. Occasionally, phantastic genealogies were constructed deriving native Southeast Asiatic dynasties from some famous dynasty of ancient India. The best known case is that of the recent kings of Cambodia who claim descent from the ancient kings of Indraprastha (Delhi). The last Burmese dynasty, founded by a village headman in the 18th century, claimed descent from the Sakya kings of Kapilavatthu, a claim which would have made them blood relatives of the Buddha himself. One type of such fictitious genealogies deserves special attention as it has a deeper meaning than merely to serve the glorification of the dynasty. The kings of Funan (3rd to 7th centuries A.D.) and those of ancient Cambodia were said to descend from a Brahman who had come from India and from the daughter of the serpent king of the country. The legend is still alive in Cambodia, the Brahman being replaced in the modern version by a prince of Indraprastha. It seems that similar dynastic legends existed in most parts of Southeast Asia. The meaning is clear. The Nāgas, the serpent demons, are the original masters of the soil. By his descent from the daughter of the Nāga king the monarch had a legitimate claim to the soil of his kingdom which, in theory at least, thereby became his personal property. A Chinese report tells us that in the 13th century the people of Cambodia believed that the king nightly cohabited with the serpent goddess of the soil who visited him in his palace in human form. Obviously he was thought thereby to renew the connection between himself and the soil of his kingdom. Thus the king in ancient Cambodia, as an incarnation of the Devarāja and as a descendant and at the same time spouse of the goddess of the soil, formed a real magic center linking the empire to the divine forces of the heavens as well as of the earth.

643 772

Any account of the conceptions of state and kingship in Southeast Asia would be incomplete without at least mentioning the great importance of the regalia. Some of these, as the umbrella and the crown, have cosmological meaning as noted above. Moreover, the umbrella was thought to be the seat of a protective genius who favored the king with his advice and who in critical moments might even actively intervene on behalf of the dynasty. Other

14: Heine-Geldern E-4 (no date) 1942 ALl Southeast Asia ALl

regalia are thought to be possessed of magic forces, such as the royal sword of Cambodia which, it is believed, if drawn from its scabbard without the prescribed ritual, would bring disaster upon the country. This magical character of the regalia is even more stressed in the Malay Peninsula and in Indonesia. It culminates in the curious conception prevalent among the Bugis and Makassarese of Celebes, according to which it is really the regalia which reign, the prince governing the state only in their name.

The deification of the king, while raising him to an almost unbelievably exalted position with regard to his subjects, has in no way succeeded in stabilizing government, rather the contrary. As explained above, the theory of divine incarnation, and even more so that of rebirth and of karma, provided an easy subterfuge for usurpers. The fact that the relatively easy task of seizing the palace, as in Burma and Siam, of or seizing the regalia, as in certain parts of Indonesia, often sufficed to be accepted as king by the whole nation, was bound to act as an additional incitement to rebellion. Moreover, the immense power and the lack of restrictions which the king enjoyed invited to abuses which in the end made the monarch obnoxious to his subjects and hastened his downfall. To this came the vagueness of the rules of succession. Sometimes the king himself chose his successor. Sometimes the ministers appointed a prince as king. Then again the queens unofficially but efficiently exercised their influence in favor of a prince of their choice. Often the crown simply fell to the prince who was the quickest to seize the palace and to execute his brothers. Under these circumstances it is no wonder that the empires of Southeast Asia from the very beginning were torn by frequent rebellion, often resulting in the overthrow of kings or even dynasties. The earliest reports we have, those from Chinese sources on the kingdom of Funan, reveal such conditions to have existed as early as the 3rd century A.D. If there was a long period of oppression and unrest, rebellion and its concomitant, dacoity, could become practically a popular tradition which it was difficult to eradicate. Such was the case, for instance, in Burma during the 18th and 19th centuries, and it is in the light of such a past that recent events in that country ought to be seen.

SURVIVAL OF TRADITIONS

In order to realize how deeply the populations of Farther India were affected by the cosmological structure of the state one need only think of the division of the Siamese people into the classes of the right and of the left which, not long ago, determined the services each person was obliged to render to the state. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the cosmomagic